

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/675,890	09/30/2003	LaSalle R. Swenson	104362-1	6129	
23490 7	7590 03/22/2006		EXAMINER		
JOHN G TOLOMEI, PATENT DEPARTMENT			ALEXANDER, LYLE		
UOP LLC 25 EAST ALG	ONQUIN ROAD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
P O BOX 5017	7		1743		
DES PLAINES, IL 60017-5017			DATE MAILED: 03/22/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				%
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/675,890	SWENSON ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Lyle A. Alexander	1743	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address	
WHIC - Exten after S - If NO - Failur Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DASIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication, period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communic D (35.U.S.C. § 133)	•
Status				
2a) <u></u> 3) <u></u>	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 Ja</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters, pro		ts is
	on of Claims	•		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or			
Application	on Papers			
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1.	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.1:	, ,
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)[ :	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau see the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	<b>;</b>
2)  Notice 3)  Inform	(s) of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		



Application/Control Number: 10/675,890

Art Unit: 1743

Upon updating the search, new art has been found and is applied in the new grounds of rejection below.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1 and 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (USP 4.496,249) in view of Lowell (USP 5,360,743).

Lee et al. teach a method for determining the amount of adsorbate adsorbed on a solid. Column 2 lines 12+ teach the activation energy is calculated. Column 2 lines 32+ teach the catalyst is loaded with a sample and the temperature is increased and the gas is desorbed. Column 5-7 teach various relationships of time, temperature and adsorption of the gases.

Lee et al. is silent to the use of the claimed "blank run" and the exact mathematical relationships of claims 1 and 3.

Lowell teach a similar method that measures the surface area of a catalyst. It is known to use a non-absorbable gas, such as helium, to calibrate the sample cell. This gas has been read on the claimed "inert gas".

It would have been within the skill of the art to modify Lee et al. in view of Lowell and use an inert gas, such as helium, to calibrate the sample cells.

The court decided In re Boesch (205 USPQ 215) that optimization of a result effective variable is ordinarily within the skill of the art. A result effective variable is one Art Unit: 1743

that has well known and predictable results. The chosen empherical relationship between the observed or measured temperature and amount of catalyst would have been within the skill of the art and have the well known and predictable results of making a standard reference curve. Further, one having ordinary skill in the art would have expected similar results from the equations taught by Lee et al. as those presently claimed.

It would have been within the skill of the art to further modify Lee et al. and use the empirical relationships taught by claims 1 and 3 as optimization of a result effective variable as the results of these equations would have been expected to be similar to those of the equations taught by Lee et al.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Lowell together, further in view of Wilson (USP 6,063,633).

See Lee et al. in view of Lowell supra.

Lee et al. in view of Lowell is silent to the conducting the steps on a plurality of solid catalyst.

Wilson teaches a method for determining the catalytic activity at different temperatures and measuring the relative temperatures (see claims 42+). The sample is contacted with catalyst support that contains a plurality of catalysts which has been read on the claimed "contacting" steps. It is advantageous to simultaneous test a plurality of different solids/catalyst to obtain more data on the catalyst behavior at the same time.

Art Unit: 1743

It would have been within the skill of the art to modify Lee et al. in view of Lowell together, further in view of Wilson (USP 6,063,633) and perform the steps on plural catalytic solid surfaces to gain the above advantages.

Page 4

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lyle A. Alexander whose telephone number is 571-272-1254. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Wednesday and Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lyle A Alexander Primary Examiner Art Unit 1743